

Application No. 09/786,557

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 9 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1-6 and 9 are amended.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to their undersigned representative in a phone interview on June 25, 2004. During the interview, the invention claimed in claim 1 and the cited references, in particular U.S. Patent No. 5,613,159 to Colnot, were discussed. Colnot was cited in the subject Office Action and it was discussed that Colnot does not teach or suggest at least the single data wire, in cooperation with the other claimed elements of claim 1, as described in the application specification and depicted in FIG. 1.

Claims 1-6 and 9 have been amended as to form in accordance with U.S. practice. No narrowing amendments are intended.

Claims 1-6 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Timson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,041,412) in view of Kenneth et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,594,233), in further view of Colnot (U.S. Patent No. 5,613,159). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

First, the rejection did not identify any motivation in the cited references, either implicitly or explicitly, to combine the references as suggested in the Office Action. Without such motivation to combine, no prima facie case for obviousness can exist. Moreover, even if the cited references were combined as suggested, they would not meet the claims.

Timson discloses that "[i]n the dual secure data module scheme of the preferred embodiments of the present invention, data operation which require permissions can only be performed in a dual secure data module reader wherein both an enabling module and an interrogated module are utilized." Column 10, lines 25-35. Referring to FIG. 1 of Timson, the two secured data modules are identified as card readers 8 and 9, each connected to CPU 2 via a separate connection. This is not the single data wire communication bus claimed in claim 1 and

Application No. 09/786,557

depicted in FIG. 1 of the present application. Further, with reference to FIGS. 2 and 3 of Timson, the communications between CPU 2 and card readers 8 and 9 are CPU-to-CPU communications on these separate connections. Note CPUs 81 and 91 in FIGS. 2 and 3, respectively. Timson therefore teaches an apparatus having two autonomous card readers, each with its own CPU. Timson does not teach or suggest the card receiving device comprising a card connector connected to the central processing unit by means of the communication bus, the contact card connector being therefore connected to said single data wire, as claimed in claim 1.

Kenneth is directed to a multiple standard smart card reader having a single entry slot. Kenneth does not teach or suggest a contactless read head comprising a serial interface directly connected to said single data wire, in cooperation with the other claimed elements of claim 1.

Colnot also does not teach or suggest the reader claimed in claim 1. As identified in the subject Office Action, the combination of Timson and Kenneth does not teach or suggest "a central processing unit comprising means for emitting and receiving, on a communication bus having a single data wire," "a contact card connector . . . connected to said single data wire," and "a contactless read head for contactless chip card, comprising . . . a serial interface that is directly connected to said single data wire of said communication bus," in cooperation with the other claimed elements. With reference to FIGS. 4 and 5, Colnot discloses inserting a memory card 30 into a transceiver device 20, forming a portable set 15 that is kept on a person (refer to column 8, lines 1-10). Colnot therefore adapts the memory card to form a portable set having two different protocols. Colnot does not teach or suggest the communication bus having a single data wire as claimed in claim 1.

Because the cited references do not teach or suggest the reader of claim 1, claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-6 and 9 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for the reasons set

Application No. 09/786,557

forth above. The various rejections to claims 2-6 and 9 are also traversed but not expressly argued in light of the allowability of the underlying base claim.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,



Amy M. Salmela

Registration No. 55,910

Customer No. 24113
Patterson, Thuent, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.
4800 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100
Telephone: (612) 252-1538